

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 remain in the prosecution.

### **Response to Arguments**

The Examiner states that the Applicant's arguments filed 6/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### **Rejections of the Claims**

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)**

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8, 9, 15, 18-21, 25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Poznanski (US 5,848,385 or "Poznanski"). See Office Action, paragraph 2. Dependent claims 6, 7, 12-14, 16, 17, 22-24, 26, and 29-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Poznanski in view of Berger (US 6,304,841 or "Berger"), which purportedly properly incorporates Brown et al. (US 5,477,451 or "Brown"). See Office Action, paragraph 4.

The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees with these rejections. However, in an effort to expedite the present application to allowance, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 15, and 27. Dependent claim 11 has also been amended for consistency with the independent claims.

The Applicant notes that the amendment of the claims in this fashion should not be interpreted as the Applicant's concurrence with the Examiner's rejection but, instead, an effort to bring this application to allowance as quickly as possible. In that regard, the Applicant expressly reserves the right to pursue the previously presented claims and/or new claims directed to previously unclaimed subject matter in a continuation application prior to the issuance of the present application.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to set forth, in part, "estimating a probability of correctness of the initial translation; estimating a probability of correctness of the one or more modified target language translations; determining whether one or more of the modified target language translations represents an improved translation in comparison with the initial current target language translation by comparing the estimated probability of correctness of the initial translation with the estimated probability of correctness of the one or more modified target language translations;" and "setting a modified target language translation with a higher probability based on the comparison as the modified current target language translation." Claims 15 and 27 have been amended in a similar fashion.

Nothing in Poznanski, Berger, nor Brown et al. teaches or suggests amended claims 1, 15, and 27.

The Examiner states that claim 6, which sets forth one type of probability, is obvious in view of Berger. Berger states that "Preferably, the translation match score  $P(F.\text{vertline}.E)$  for the source text F and the target hypothesis E is the translation match score for the alignment estimated to be most probable" at column 2, lines 38-41. This section of Berger is in the "Background Section" and recites the prior art system of Brown et al. Brown et al. is also discussed in the background section of the present application, where it is explained that Brown et al. utilizes a "stack decoder." In a stack decoder, such as that taught by Brown et al., the universe of possible translations are organized into a graph structure and then exhaustively searched until an optimal solution (translation) is found. Thus, any estimated probability is clearly not based on initial translations and incrementally modified translations, as set forth in claim 1.

Further, per MPEP §2143.01, "...it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." In re Linter, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560,

562 (CCPA 1972). The Examiner's statement that the motivation to combine Poznanski with Berger is to determine the most probable alignment is not proper motivation. Respectfully, it clearly is not proper to throw together references without any motivation to combine the references other than reasoning that the references may accomplish a step recited in the claims of the present application. There must be an actual motivation to combine these references, which the Examiner has failed to indicate.

The Examiner takes Official Notice regarding claims 11, 12-14, and 29-32, or regarding portions thereof. Applicants disagree that repeating translations until a proper translation is found and/or until the occurrence of a termination condition is well known. Applicant, thus, formally requests a specific showing of the subject matter in ALL of the claims in any future action. Note excerpt from MPEP:

"If the applicant traverses such an [Official Notice] assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position." See MPEP 2144.03.

Neither Poznanski, Berger, nor Brown et al., either singularly or in combination, teach the subject matter set forth in amended claims 1, 15, and 27. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-9, 15, 18-21, 25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 6,7, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 22-24, 26, and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Marcu

Date: 11/15/01

By: 

Stefanie M. Zilka, Reg. No. 45,929

Carr & Ferrell LLP

2200 Geng Road

Palo Alto, CA 95054

Phone: (650) 812-3400

Fax: (650) 812-3444